DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 862 EA 023 347

AUTHOR King, Byron; Kerchner, Charles Taylor
TITLE Defining Principal Leadership in an Era of Teacher Empowerment.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership; *Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Responsibility; Occupational Information; *Principals

ABSTRACT

Principals are witnessing major shifts in who is involved in making decisions while at the same time they receive mixed messages from their superiors about what a good principal should do. Researchers associated with Claremont Project VISION interviewed principals and administrator association leaders in school districts. Five school districts are the focus for this paper: Pittsburgh, Rochester, Louisville (Jefferson County), Cincinnati, and Miami-Dade County. Three general conclusions were reached: (1) principals have a reason to be concerned, because their jobs are changing and they face ambiguity; (2) district policies can contribute to a reduction in principal role strain and can encourage them to engage actively in reform; (3) a new set of job descriptions is emerging around principals who can provide leadership in highly collaborative decision making settings. Factors that make principals uncomfortable include lack of role clarity, fear of teacher union goals, mixed signals from district, and the lack of training for new roles. The next section discusses the impact of district policies on principal perspectives. Two main qualities of principals who embrace teacher professionalism are identified; these principals view themselves as empowered and as exercising more leadership than power. A general conclusion about principal's changing from control to commitment completes this paper. (20 references) (RR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Kerchner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED336862

DEFINING PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP IN AN ERA OF TEACHER EMPOWERMENT

by Byron King
San Diego City Schools
and Charles Taylor Kerchner
The Claremont Graduate School

Introduction: Fretting on the Sidelines

As school reform has become a topic at the bargaining table and teachers talk of professionalism, principals are often left standing on the sidelines. They wonder how the alliance between reformers and unions will alter their jobs and their occupational identity. They wonder with good reason. Principals are witnessing major shifts in who is involved in making decisions while at the same time they receive mixed messages from their superiors about what a "good" principal should do.

Over the last year, researchers associated with Claremont Project VISION have interviewed principals and administrator association leaders in several school districts, five of which are used as the basis for this paper: Pittsburgh, Rochester, Louisville (Jefferson County), Cincinnati and Miami-Dade County. These and other districts have undertaken reforms intended to increase the professionalization of teacher work. Most initiatives were motivated by the Carnegie Corporation's report on teaching, *A Nation Prepared*, or at least have been influenced by it.[1] The programs include peer review of teachers, teacher career ladders (lead teacher positions), and teacher involvement in school decision making (shared decision making).

Based on these data, three general conclusions can be reached. First, principal concern is not without reason; their jobs are changing, and they face ambiguity. Second, district policies can contribute to a reduction in principal role strain and encourage them to engage actively in reform. Third, a new set of job descriptions is emerging in principals who can provide leadership in the highly collaborative decision making settings being created by current reforms.

Presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, April 5, 1991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 023 347

Principal as Gatekeeper

Our concern with the principal stems in part from their historically recognized function as the fulcrum of change. As Berman and McLaughlin note in their "change agent" study:

> The principal is the gatekeeper of change. If you pick one figure in the school system who really matters in terms of whether you get change or not, it is the principal. [2]

In the districts we visited, principals fulfilled this gatekeeper role. Frank Petruzielo, Associate Superintendent for the Bureau of Professionalization in Dade County Public Schools, says that "the single greatest obstacle to engaging in a restructuring agenda, and making the tough decisions that are going to be necessary to move in that direction, is the principals."[3] Principals have, in large part, been left out of the current discussion about reform, Petruzielo notes, "nobody has advanced nationally a reason for them to buy in." We are faced with a situation in which principal leadership is needed to affect change but where substantial numbers of the would-be leaders are disaffected.

Change is not impossible without principal support; we witnessed schools where continued teacher pressure for reform resulted in the removal of principals who obstructed change. But change is clearly much harder without principal support. Principals have control over all information coming to the school from the central office. They control all the resources that facilitate calling meetings and causing decisions to be implemented. If the principal does not understand or support shared decision making, it is not likely to occur. All districts have stories of where the process broke down at schools because of principal resistance. Thus, uncomfortable principals are a source of concern.

What Makes Principals Uncomfortable?

Much principal discomfort is unfocused and diffuse dissatisfaction. It is also frequently unspoken dissatisfaction, or at least reluctantly spoken dissatisfaction, because principals gain and retain their positions in part because of their ability to sense the political winds in their organizations. They sense that it is blowing away from them. As we examined principal reactions and voiced discomfort, we found it fell into five categories.

Lack of Role Clarity

The new role of the principal is not clear, as some top administrators readily acknowledge. Cincinnati Superintendent Lee Etta Powell notes that "the more that teachers begin to take on certain responsibilities, I think more administrators, school based in particular, seem to question 'What is my role now?'" Rochester legal counsel Adam Kaufman actively participates in the contract bargaining creating school reform in the district. He points out that the role of the administrator has not been clear in the reforms taking place in that district. They are not the singular instructional leaders of the school. Yet the principal's role description remains "an unanswered question."

Attacks on Principal-as-Instructional-Leader Model

The Carnegie report argued that teachers should have more direct responsibility for decisions over curriculum and instruction. To support this concept, the report recommends a governance structure that would provide much less authority to an administrator:

> No organization can function well without strong and effective leadership and schools are no exception. But the single model for leadership found in most schools is better suited to business or government than to the function of education. The model of a non-teaching principal as head of the school can work in support of the collegial style we propose, but there are many other models that should be tried. Among them are schools headed by the Lead Teachers acting as a committee, one of whom acts like a managing partner in a professional partnership. In such schools, the teachers might hire administrators, rather than the other way around. Once the fundamental idea that the primary source of expertise for improving school lies within them, many ways to organize for leadership are possible.[4]

The idea of teacher leadership over instruction is taken to be in conflict with the idea of "principal as instructional leader" that was the hallmark of the effective schools movement. For principals, and many other administrators, it has the air of unreality. As Petruzielo said:

> If you look at the Carnegie Report and you look at the scenario that was developed there, it makes [the principal's role] sound like some kind of milktoast, bush-league facilitator, or something that you could do without. And that the way that you make the schools better is that you turn them over to a group of teachers who with little ad hoc committees will go down the yellow brick road together.

For Marc Tucker, the report's major author, the reaction was personal. Tucker moved to Rochester, in part to work with the reforms there. He found that some principals were "gunning for him" and walked out of his presentations.[5] A leader in the administrator's organization in Cincinnati notes:

> The only body of research . . . that meant anything in the last fifteen or twenty years, was the effective schools research. That was based on results. . . Every one of those studies, as far as I know, came out with one conclusion that a strong building administrator was a key figure in improving academic achievement for students. I think the Carnegie Report, and I also believe that all the new labor negotiations here and in Rochester and in other places, have thrown that out and we're seeing the effects of that. I think the authority of building administration has been undermined.

Reform Agendas Negotiated between District and Teacher Union

Administrator groups are left out or perceived as minor players in the reform negotiations taking place between districts and teachers' unions. In Rochester, individual principals were involved with the development of the peer review program, but the administrator's group refused to become officially involved and ultimately filed suit against it. Rochester administrator's association president Richard Stears observes that superintendent Peter McWalters claims his group 'doesn't ever want to play.' Stears replies that all agreements in the district are basically bilateral and administrators are "not ever allowed in the ball field in any meaningful or significant way." The perception that McWalters favors teachers over administrators is exacerbated by the fact that McWalters became superintendent without any experience as a school principal.

Contract Language Improving Teacher Work Life

Agreements made between districts and teacher unions expand the leadership opportunities offered to teachers. Lead Teacher positions in Dade County, Rochester, Cincinnati, and Pittsburg now allow teachers function as instructional leaders. Through the peer review process, teacher evaluators make decisions about the continued employment of probationary teachers in Rochester and Cincinnati. Rochester's School Based Planning process requires that the governance committee contain a numerical majority composed of teachers.

Each of of these professionalization reforms intrudes on the traditional authority of the principal. Principals who view themselves as the "captain of the ship" feel that their ability to carry out their job is impaired.

Principals in Cincinnati feel themselves squeezed between professionalization reforms and improvements in work rules contained in the last two teacher contracts. According to one principal, the general perception of school administrators is that teachers "walked away with the kitchen sink" in contract negotiations. Not only had they gained peer review and a career ladder, work rules improved in relation to non-classroom supervision, preparation time, and maximum teaching load. These changes restrict the way in which principals utilize resources to operate schools.

Fear of Teacher Union Goals

There is an underlying fear on the part of administrators that teacher unions believe that schools can be run without them. Rochester superintendent McWalters is not sure that Rochester Teacher Association (RTA) president Adam Urbanski believes that collegial responsibility to run a school necessarily requires some type of administrator. Cincinnati superintendent Lee Etta Powell is not sure how far Cincinnati Federation of Teachers president Tom Mooney wants to take the concept of teacher participation in the affairs of school. She wonders whether he wants to "turn schools upside down" by "eliminating principals."

Teacher union leaders respond to administrator fears by focusing on improved results for the schools. Tom Mooney says to principals who are afraid of losing their power "you may be in charge, but what results are you getting? You're beating your head against the wall and you don't really have a highly productive work force." RFT Vice-President Tom Gillett insists that in the "short range and long range," there will be a principal at the school. AFT President Al Shanker says that increasing the professional responsibilities of teachers does not mean the elimination of administrators:

> Does that mean that there'll be fewer people working in leadership and administrative and professional positions? No, but they will be working closer to the action. As a matter of fact, the whole notion of

differentiation means that, within each team, there will be some top-quality people who know about organization and materials and training new people.[6]

Mixed Signals from the District.

Principals often receive mixed signals from the school district with regard to the way they are expected to run a school. They are told to be collaborative, yet districts expect them to act in the old authoritarian ways. Even though shared decision making requires more time for a staff to reach a conclusion, principals report that central office staff still demand that decisions be made on important issues within one afternoon. According to one principal, the message from the district is "The principal is expected to fix things quickly especially if some things are wrong or there's some objections and you're to take care of it immediately and be able to do it. (With shared decision making) You can't always do that."

Teachers may arrive at decisions that are not what the district expected. Principals can find themselves torn between what their staff feels is important and the demands of their supervisors. A principal in one district explained how the district wanted a teacher selected to represent that school at an annual recognition luncheon for district teachers. The staff felt that it would be divisive to select a single individual, and notified the district of their decision not to send anyone. The superintendent's office called up the principal and ordered him to select a representative, causing great frustration among the teachers. In another district, an area manager ordered an elementary school principal to sent all his staff and students to a "Say No To Drugs" rally at the local high school. The staff determined that they could better serve their community by holding a rally at their own site, which they did. The principal was accused of being "disloyal" by his area manager because he went along with a decision democratically made by his staff.

Districts have not clarified principal accountability. In theory and in law, the principal is ultimately responsible for the consequences of everything that occurs at the school. Principals correctly point out that it is unfair for them to be solely responsible for decisions made by their teachers.

Lack of Training for New Role

Principals are asked to do things that they were not trained to do. For example, very few principals, or teachers, are skilled in the areas of mediating conflict, facilitating meetings, and building consensus. With the initiation of School Based Planning in Rochester, McWalters found:

> I have principals who are calling for help. They are ready, they've done their assessments. They want treatment. They are responsive and I feel totally inadequate because support is not there. I don't have a good answer for the staff development side of it. I am very much into the model for peer coaching. We are closer into the model for teachers than administrators.

Districts attempt to address the issue of training principals, but simply do not have enough resources. Proctor & Gamble (Cincinnati) and Xerox (Rochester) offered their employee training programs to district employees. Dade County provided each school in the School Based Management/Shared Decision Making pilot a small staff development budget that could be used to hire consultants in organizational development.

The lack of training for principals can increase resistance to district reform plans. Cincinnati Public Schools and the Cincinnati Federation of Teachers made major breakthroughs in their 1988 contract talks because of the joint training union and district leadership received in Principled Negotiations through Conflict Management Institute. However, middle managers and principals were not given training in the process. They did not understand the symbolic context of trust and mutual respect that was essential to achieve agreement on the contract's reform language. As a result, principals express unnecessary fear about .how the contract will impact their jobs.

Impact of District Policies on Principal Perspectives

While we clearly encountered instances of principal reluctance and resistance in the face of negotiated teacher reforms, we also witnessed situations in which district policies and superintendent leadership provided honored roles for principals in the change process. First, districts symbolically and tangibly signal to principals that they are of greater, not

less, importance than in the past. Second, simultaneous with teacher professionalism efforts, districts use school site management reforms to increase the amount of freedom principals possess to shape and guide a school. Third, districts put training and interpersonal support networks into place.

Miami-Dade sent a clear message about the importance of principals as it entered the first year of its school site management plan. It put all principals on a pay grade equal to that of most central office department heads. Said Associate Superintendent Frank Petruzielo, "Now the incentive and the dollars are in the school."

> We've put a number on the jersey of our elementary, middle and senior high principals that is the highest number you can have without being in a job like mine [associate superintendent].

The message was particularly strong for elementary principals who found themselves at the same pay grade as their high school counterparts. Louisville-Jefferson County sent its principals a similar message by wiping out two intermediate levels of administrators between the school site managers and the superintendent. All 155 principals now report directly to Superintendent Donald Ingwerson. As a part of this arrangement, principals have direct access to district office electricians, carpenters, purchasing agents other essential but often previously hard to get services. The other part of the arrangement is that principals feel that they can get the superintendent's attention personally if a problem demands it.

Principal participation on joint labor-management committees is pro ing to be another way of gaining both direct involvement and principal support for the changes being brought about by the new labor relations. Each district has examples of these committees. Perhaps the most elaborate structure can be found in Pittsburgh where the Professionalism In Education Partnership is overseen by a 23 person steering committee and there are 16 subcommittees involving more than 300 people. In Cincinnati, administrators and teachers on the Allocations Committee distributes some 40 teacher positions and $200,000 to schools experiencing enrollment shifts after the start of school. The experience sometimes even creates appreciation of administrators as Allocations Committee teacher member Bebe Freeman recalls:

> Part of it, I think, is that when you work on a committee like this, and folks really sit down and work face to face, and solve problems

> together, the working relationship there becomes evident and it's a trusting kind of thing.
> So when we get these wonderful working relationships going with people, you know just about to a person that those are the folks you can trust, you can count on to be there, who are just as concerned about the kids in the district as we are.

Several districts have linked more autonomy for school sites with negotiated teacher professionalism agreements. In Miami-Dade, schools in the site management project gain substantial ability to reallocate funds and positions. In Louisville and Miami schools where teachers elect site management are free to design their own school plans, and they can seek waivers of the union contract, board rules or even state law. In Miami, principals in the site-managed schools reported directly to the central office bypassing the area superintendents. For Cecil Daniels, principal of Myrtle Grove Elementary School in Miami-Dade, gaining a "refuge from the domination of the district's area office" was motivation to participate.[7] During the 1989-1990 school year, the district placed site-managed schools back in the regional reporting structure. The principals we interviewed reported mixed reactions to this new arrangement, depending on the responsiveness of their area office.

Pittsburgh, Louisville, and Miami-Dade have invested heavily in professional development for principals. The Louisville approach, was to create a professional development center, the Gheens Academy, away from a school site as a place where principals could plan with their staffs. One of the Gheens activities was disarmingly straightforward: participants read books and talked about ideas. Just as the professionalism is conveying to teachers that they have an intellectual capacity to understand and design instruction, discussions among school managers carries the impression that they know something about organizations.

In Dade County schools, the district had provided time for informal interaction among the principals through conferences and periodic meetings of schools involved with shared decision making. Some of the most enthusiastic principals had been sent to national conferences where they met other principal engaged in shared decision making. This peer interaction established a strong cultural norm.

Qualities of Principals Embracing Teacher Professionalism

We believe a new mode of principal leadership is emerging. It is not mild and milktoast. It does not swathed in affective language psychobable. These principals are pragmatists with vision. They are hands on managers, direct in style and language. They are willing to forego the trappings of power--who chairs the meeting--for the substance of the result. They don't so much share power as they multiply it. They understand the value of what Sergiovanni describes as "leadership density," where "principal leadership can be understood as an enabling process that frees, encourages, and energizes others to join with the principal in the leadership process." [8] They are also entrepreneurs. They gather and redistribute resources and encourage others to do so. They, like their teachers, have chafed under bureaucratic restrictions. While their personal styles (along with gender, body type, and ethnicity) are amazingly varied, they share in common a realization that one manages best by developing the talent and commitment of others rather than gaining their compliance with organizational rules. In many cases they are the kinds of leaders that old bureaucracies found dangerously independent.

Principals View Themselves as Empowered

These principals find that sharing authority with teachers and other staff is empowering to themselves. They find satisfaction in a school that "works" for both students and teachers. Says Cecil Daniels of Myrtle Grove Elementary: "I think I am more empowered now" because of "better communication".

> I used to come here at 7:15 in the morning and I'd leave at 7:00 at night just trying to get the whole job done. Things are much better for me health-wise, home, and here at school. I suffer from high blood pressure, but it's been because of the way I perceive things here at school. . . (Now I am able to take) my wife to a movie during the week.

The theme of personal well being was repeated by others. Another principal in a Dade County shared decision making school says that it,

> makes my job less strenuous, less demanding, less authoritative. Still I'm getting exactly what I want. I'm getting good teachers, I'm getting teachers to produce. I'm getting teachers to be creative, to be interested in kids, and programs. I'm getting a whole lot more than I would single-handedly. It's not that I'm giving up anything because I still have power and I don't want to be a dictator.

Matt Benningfield, principal of the Byck Elementary School in Louisville says, "this thing has probably added 10 years to my life. I don't have to go to bed at night worrying about problems; I've given some of them away."

Peter Bucholtz, principal of Miami Palmetto Senior High School put it this way,

> I look at it in terms of I've shared some of my headaches and some of my problems with other staff members. A high school principal shouldn't be such a lonely position. You can feel very isolated. But here I've got a means to share the problems, also I can get, when I get the endorsement and support, I have a group that's going to help me implement it in supporting me. So I see it as actually strengthening my ability to get things done."

Principals who are comfortable with increased responsibilities for teachers are able to admit that they don't know all the best answers about running a school. Barth suggests that when principals "admit ignorance," they send a "powerful invitation" to teachers to "become a genuine school leader and a friend and a colleague of the principal."[9]

Principals are realistic about their ability to improve teacher performance and school effectiveness by administrative fiat. Gerald Dreyfuss Assistant Superintendent for the Office of School-Based Management in Dade County, reflects on his experiences as a principal:

> Certainly when your working with professionals you can't just tell a hundred teachers to do it this way because you say it's the best way. It doesn't work. I know as a teacher, as a principal that these things don't work. Teachers do what they want to do when they get behind that door. And so in order to get their participation, and in order to get their thinking as to what will work, they've got to be part of the decision making.

Principals Allow Their Staffs to "Win" in Decision Making

Principals are comfortable enough to allow the rest of the staff "win" on issues. At one high school in Rochester, the teachers wanted to reinstitute a bell to mark passing periods. The principal was opposed to the idea. "In the old days," said the teachers, "the administration would have said 'no bells' and that would have been the end of it." The the School Based Planning (shared decision making) process, the issue received a full discussion and was ultimately approved.

Teachers Volunteer to Give Authority Back to Principals

When teachers first become involved with shared decision making, they want to know about everything that goes on in the school. They soon discover it is very time-consuming and tedious to review every decision that a principal must make daily. In the case of schools we encountered in Miami, teachers restored authority back to principals to conduct certain managerial tasks. The act of teacher empowerment of principals means that their source of power has shifted from the organizational structure to their constituencies.

In most shared decision making schools that are working well, teachers and the principal have mutually agreed on the boundaries separating decisions requiring teacher consultation from those that can be made by the principal unilaterally. One criteria often used is to make a distinction between strategic decisions and those related to daily operations. Teachers frequently wanted to be involved in decisions related to hiring staff, but were willing to leave personnel evaluation to the administrators.

Principals Learn How to Manage Symbols

Five years ago Marilyn Hohmann became principal of a school with a strong athletic tradition but lagging academics. The Bulldogs are still big business at Fairdale High in Jefferson County, Kentucky, but the school's symbolism is being extended to work off the playing field. "I'm in the community at least two nights a week," Hohmann said. The key to obtaining a sympathetic audience is to tie academic emphasis to changes in the employment market that have severely affected the surrounding community. "This is a community that was formerly middle class," she said.

Fairdale is also consciously dealing with its beliefs and belief statements. Its publications reflect a mixture of statements, some from each of several sources. The repetition of these statements in conversation and in school publications suggests that the process of announcing principles is important to bringing them into the school's culture. "Make no mistake about it," Hohmann said, "we are into culture building here.

Leadership is "the art or process of influencing people so that they will strive willingly and enthusiastically toward the achievement of group goals."[11] Leaders cause people to act because they have come to believe it is right, not because they have been ordered to do so. Kouzes and Posner say that the way to truly understand the meaning of leadership is to "assume that everyone who works for you is a volunteer."[12]

Koontz and Weihrich explain that power is "the ability of groups or individuals to induce or influence the beliefs or actions of other persons or groups." Authority is the "right in a position (and through it the person occupying that position) to exercise discretion in making decisions affecting others."[13] In other words, authority is the exercise of power attached to a position within the organization. In the case of a principal, authority is vested in that position through state law and school board policy.

Leadership is more important than power. Principals who are leaders focus on making a school function well for both staff and students. They realize that goal can best be realized by being willing to delegate power to others. Barth calls this a "community of leaders." He points out that: "(l)eadership is making what you believe happen. Everyone deserves an opportunity for leadership."[14]

Dade County's Gerald Dreyfuss emphasizes that the leadership role of principals is extremely important.

> He (the principal) knows how to work with people, becomes a leader of leaders, rather than a leader of sheep, which is the real concept of school based management shared decision making. The principal's role changes entirely. He still is a leader, he still is a focal point for decision making. For a matter of fact I see principals as gaining a lot of power through school based management . . .

Principals Encourage Teachers to Innovate

The principal who is comfortable with teacher professionalization is willing to let teachers work on a project with minimal oversight. This means that the principal may have to step aside and allow teachers to make mistakes. Principals report that it is sometimes very difficult to sit quietly during a discussion of the school's shared decision making group. In the long run, it proves to be valuable to allow to staff to make their own mistakes. This may include getting tough with teachers and refusing to bail them out when they are stuck. Part of exercising authority is making

We are building a community culture outside and a professional culture inside."

Teachers at Fairdale and elsewhere appear willing to acknowledge that the principal holds what Lieberman and Miller call chief moral authority in a school or what Sergiovanni recognizes as "statesperson leadership."[10]

Principals have used a variety of symbols to promote a culture of collaboration. Cecil Daniels decreased the physical and psychological distance between himself and teachers by removing his desk and replacing it with a round table. The carved plaque on top of the table still says, "Cecil Daniels, Principal." One high school principal made the symbolic gesture of providing each teacher with fifty dollars for them to spend as they wished. By giving teachers something they could totally control, the principal was able to show that he was serious about their participation in decision making. After the staff at Miami's Bunche Park Elementary School determined the governance structure and established the direction for some of their innovations, they held a special assembly. A retired judge "swore in" all the staff to uphold the new "constitution" for the school. Prominent in the front lobby is a document enclosed in glass. It looks very much like a replica of the U.S. Constitution. It is Bunche Park's statement of principles, signed by all staff, publicly displayed.

Principals Exercise More Leadership than Power

Principals who are comfortable with teacher professionalization recognize the difference between leadership and power. Rochester's superintendent McWalters observes that the authority of principal is shifting from "structural power to competence in leadership." This type of principal is not threatened by working collaboratively with teachers and union representatives. He or she is able to delegate authority.

There is a confusion over the concepts of leadership and power as they apply to schools. Principals who feel threatened by school reform tend to view their ability to lead as resting solely on the power vested in them by the district. Leadership, however, is a much more subtle concept.

difficult decisions that could make another teacher unhappy. Decisions about teaching assignment, facility use, and budget can be difficult, whether a principal or a teacher is making them. Principals fight their desire to "protect" staff from unpleasant situations. Teachers can be very skeptical when principals and districts ask for their opinions. Principals find entrusting them with decisions helps to convince teachers that they are sincerely interested operating the school in a different way.

Principals Become Teachers of Management Practice

A Nation Prepared uses the metaphor of "school as collegium" to describe how schools should be run. It proposes that Lead Teachers would help all staff address issues of curriculum and instruction as well providing assistance to new teachers and those "not performing up to par."[15] Unfortunately, there is much to managing a school than what goes on in the classroom. Martin and Willower found that high school principals spent only 17.4% of their time on matters related to their school's academic program.[16]

When teachers become involved in shared decision making, they discover that there are many issues that must be addressed that are not within their realm of experience. School budgets, interview procedures, facility use, staffing requirements, teaching assignments, and legal rights of students are some areas where teachers have reported to lack basic knowledge to make an effective decision. Teachers then discover the value of the special expertise in basic organizational management that the principal has gained over the years. One teacher at Myrtle Grove Elementary School in Dade County said that at the beginning of shared decision making they did not realize the principal

> comes to the job with many years of experience in running a school. We thought we could run the school, and we found out we had to turn around and we had to say 'Help us.' We'd never interviewed a person. Mr. Daniels had to teach us how to interview people. We had never hired a person. He had hired all throughout his career. He taught us.

Cecil Daniels also taught the teachers to take into account the political ramifications of a decision before it is made. They learned to consider "what the community impact will be like, the impact on the parents, and our hierarchy."

Conclusion: Changing from Control to Commitment

Recent history has framed the principalship in the language of power and politics. The principalship which began as in John Dewey's words, "the prophet of the true God and the sharer in the true kingdom of God,"[17] joined forces with Frederick Taylor's scientific management movement during the first decade of this century.[18] Beginning in the mid-1950s, the rise of explicit interest groups in education shattered the progressive political consensus. A central vision of education disappeared to be replaced by an era in which politics itself defined the role of educators. If teachers became street-level bureaucrats, to use Michael Lipsky's phrase, then surely administrators had become street-level politicians, their jobs functionally defined by the necessary brokering of services and balancing of potent interests.[19] Politics became recognized as an explicit part of school administration, and political metaphor as part of administrative language

The organizational aspect of recent reforms is to recreate a singular vision within school districts and individual schools. Part of this response follows from the creation of open enrollment, magnet and specialty schools, which require that all schools, in effect, compete for students. Partly it is simply an extension of entrepreneurial imperative sweeping the country. Deal, suggests that this is a recognition "the core problems of schools are more spiritual than technical."[20]

For school leaders this means that movement toward teacher professionalism do not signal the death of the principalship. Rumors that teacher unions want to "take over" schools turn out to be unfounded in the cold reality of operating a school. But the principal's job is changing. The power of principals to lead through fear, domination, and coercion is lessening. Those who need those powers are endangered.

Notes

[1]Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century.* Rochester, N.Y.: National Center on Education and the Economy.

[2]Berman, Paul & McLaughlin, Milbrey. (1978). *Federal programs supporting educational change.* Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

[3]Interview April 24, 1990. Unless otherwise noted, quotations are from field interviews with principals, teachers and others.

[4] Carnegie Forum. *A nation prepared.*, p. 61.

[5]Central office administrator interview, Rochester.

[6]Brandt, Ron. (1990, April). On restructuring schools: A conversation with Al Shanker. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 11-16.

[7] Daniels, Cecil. (1990). A principals view: Giving up my traditional ship. *The School Administrator*, 47: 20, 22-24.

[8]Sergiovanni, Thomas. (1987). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

[9]Barth, Roland. (1988, May). Principals, teachers, and school leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*: 639-642

[10]Lieberman, Ann & Miller, Lynne (1984). *Teachers, their world, and their work.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; Sergiovanni. *The principalship.*

[11] Koontz, Harold & Weihrich, Heinz. (1988). *Management.* 9th Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, p.437

[12] Kouzes, James & Posner, Barry. (1988). *The leadership challenge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, p.26.

[13]Kouzes & Posner. *The leadership challenge.*

[14] Barth. Principals, teachers, and school leadership.

[15] Carnegie Forum. *A nation prepared.*, p. 58

[16]Martin, William & Willower, Donald. (1981). The managerial behavior of high school principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 17: 69-90.

[17] Tyack, D. & Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820-1980.* New York: Basic Books, p. 3

[18] Taylor, F.W. (1911). *Principals of scientific management.* New York: Harper Brothers.

[19]Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

[20] Deal, Terrence (1987). The culture of schools. In Sheive, Linda & Schoenheit, Marian (Eds.) *Leadership: Examining the elusive.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.